biological progeny, or on the fusion of two descent lines, which is more complicated. According to this process, one village or lineage or clan may leave its ancestral camps and pasturages and request admission into another. The host clan agrees, accepts the newcomers not as guests but as kinsmen, and gives them a fictional genealogy and fictional kinship relations. These relationships have both religious and social significance.[1] In religious terms the fictions are needed to make the guests acceptable to the local and ancestral spirits; in social terms, these kinship relations are the social relations—or at least they were until recently, and they still exert a strong influence today. A fusion of two descent lines in this manner results from fission or cleavage within one descent line; this fission may be caused by quarrels between two leaders, or by loss of herds which may cause a kinship group to break up, leaving one segment to seek admission into another group.

Fictional kinship extends also to slaves. A certain amount of slavery existed for debt or for punishment of criminals, but most of the slaves, who were never a numerous group, were captives taken in feuds and wars.[2] Such captives did not remain slaves long, as a rule; they were either put to death, or freed and accepted into the civil life of Kazakh society. If freed, they were given a fictional kinship status which soon became blurred over and indistinguishable from the rest of the society.

These are in broad outline the traditional patterns of Kazakh society. They must be borne in mind in order to understand many of the ideological and doctrinary battles between Moscow and the Kazakhs, especially Kazakh leaders.

FAMILY AND VILLAGE LIFE

The Kazakh family is by nature an extended family, composed of a man, his wife or wives, his sons and their wives and children, and his unmarried daughters. If the family is rich, it may also have further kin, both married and unmarried, who are poor and maintain themselves by working for the rich. The rich family may also contain servants who are not directly related at all, and finally slaves. The typical households, however, consist only of close kin.[3]

The authority in the family is patriarchal, resting ultimately in the hands of the father or the eldest of several brothers.[4] The authority passes from father to eldest son, or if there is no son, to the eldest surviving male of the immediate family, such as a brother or nephew. The authority of the patriarch is extensive—over women and children it is all but absolute—but it is subject to certain limitations. If it is noticed that a father is squandering his patrimony in idleness or frivolous undertakings, the village elders may remonstrate with him, and

[1] Rudenko *et al*, 1930, pp. 59-60; Valikhanov, 1904, pp. 291-292.
[2] Levshin (85), 1840, p. 330.
[3] Kharuzin, 1889, pp. 107-108; Imeretsov, 1897, pp. 1-2.
[4] Valikhanov, 1904, p. 286.

may even place the authority in the hands of an adult son, if he has one, or a brother. Recourse to such action may be taken only rarely, but it is nevertheless a recognized delimitation of paternal powers. The parental authority over the son serves as the model for all authority patterns in Kazakh society, such as those involving the village elder, the clan leader, the beg, and the khan.[1]

In the past the parental authority was limited in another sense; the family was part of a village which camped and pastured its herds in common. The leaders of the village decided when and where to camp, when to change camp, when to break up the winter concentration of herds and families and move to the more dispersed spring and summer pastures.[2] A family head disobeyed these decisions at his risk. It was to his interest to follow them, since he gained many things thereby: fellowship, social position, protection from dangers by weight of numbers, assistance in time of need. The village in turn was subordinate to the clan authority if there was one. In case of raids, feuds, or other breaches of the peace, a village leader would appeal to the clan chief for aid. In a dispute between villages, a village elder would appeal to his clan chief for a judgment in his favor.

The village elder was the judge of his community, and decided all cases, usually with the support of the other senior men of the village. Appeals from their decisions were rare, defiance of their decisions even rarer. Behind the judgment of the village leader and the other elders lay the force of social solidarity, the weight of the entire village; defiance meant ejection and flight. Defiance of father by the son had similar consequences. The ultimate authority rested with the khan, if there was one, and if he cared to use his power, for he backed his authority with an army and the right of punishment by death or imprisonment, in addition to the force of his position.

The Kazakh household could include several wives if the position and wealth of the master allowed it. In one community studied, the Adai lineage on Mangyshlak peninsula, half the men had only one wife and half had two. In general, very few families contained more than two wives, although there is in theory no upper limit on the number of wives (exclusive of concubines) that a man can have. The ideal number of wives in princely families was considered to be five or nine—in contrast to the ideal number of wives for Moslems which the Koran gives as four. The family and marriage patterns of the Kazakhs are among the traits which give a pronouncedly non-Islamic coloring to their society.[3]

A youth was given his own tent and appurtenances when he came of age; traditionally he was soon to be married, and in fact a substantial number were married by the time they were 20 years old. Even as late as 1926, 222 out of every 1,000 males were married by that age, and in former years the rate was higher. The tent was not identical with the household unit. A young married couple with children did not

[1] Izraztsov, 1897, pp. 5, 11.
[2] Radloff (104), 1893, p. 513; Rudenko et al, 1930, pp. 4-8.
[3] Karutz (73), 1910, p. 42.

Kazakh men may take more than one wife for many reasons, perhaps to gain the prestige of numerous wives, or because the first wife has not borne a son. A barren or sonless wife may be divorced and sent back to her family. The fortunate woman who has borne a son is endowed with property which is hers to hold in trust for her minor children. Should the mother of a son be widowed, she is a free agent and may remarry or not, as she pleases and whom she pleases. If a widow has no children or has only daughters, she may be forced into leviratic marriage (i.e., marriage with the brother of her deceased husband). If she has only daughters, her family may be broken up at the death of the husband.

It is in the light of these various changes in rights and statuses that the marriage is seen as pointing to the bearing of sons. There is great joy at the birth of a son, for thereby is the continuation of the line assured, and thereby is the marriage fulfilled.

The leviratic marriage is actually a form of social insurance, for thus does the Kazakh society take care of those families without a male head. The position of the conjugal family within the framework of the extended family is shown by this practice. A woman weds not her husband but her husband's family; when she marries her husband, she potentially marries her husband's brother. The marriage arrangements are made between the families, and the partners involved are not consulted. The line of the family flows not only through the husband but through his brother, and through all the close kin in the male line within the family. In medieval times, the son among both Turks and Mongols also married the widows of the deceased father other than his own mother,[1] but this form of marriage is now taboo.[2]

Within the extended family, and among close kinsmen generally, no one has his exact equal in status. The first basis for differentiation is the generation to which one belongs, the second is the order of birth, the third is chronological age. The age criterion is the least reliable and the least used, but it is there. Kazakh brothers and sisters are ranked according to order of birth, and treat one another with authority or with respect accordingly. Cousins are likewise ranked according to the order of birth of their fathers. The second son of the elder brother does not necessarily take precedence over the elder son of the second brother, however; here complicating factors come in, such as the chronological ages of the cousins in question. If there is a wide disparity in age, then the older cousin takes precedence regardless of birth order. A Kazakh treats his older brother as he does his father's younger brother, and his older sisters as he does his father's younger sisters. He calls them by the same terms and acts toward them in a similar fashion.[3]

Authority and respect tend to follow similar lines outside the family, in the village, clan, and khanate. These latter authority relations are modeled on the paternal, in a way similar to the Chinese, the Japanese, the Roman and South Slavic societies. In considering these parallels,

[1] Bichurin, 1950, p. 230.
[2] Grodekov, 1889, p. 29.
[3] Ivanaev, 1897, p. 11.

This distinction made between Batyr Srym and Kenesary by Soviet historians reflects the current Soviet attitude toward past leaders. These early khans who are now denounced are the national and cultural heroes of the Kazakhs. They are celebrated in the folk literature, the poetry, and the tales which parents tell their children; they are the basis of common comparisons ("as brave as . . ., as clever as . . ."). For the Kazakhs these figures are symbols of their unity as a people. Moreover, they are the ancestors of those living today, according to the traditional Kazakh ties of descent and blood. In denouncing them, the Soviets are denouncing and insulting the very people most venerated by the Kazakhs, aristocrats and commoners alike.

The hold of the olden khans still continues after more than 30 years of Soviet rule. The Kazakh native writers demonstrate a profound desire to seize upon these old figures for literary and historical themes. They stubbornly resist relinquishment of these themes when the official line changes anew. Despite three years of the sharpest attacks and polemics, adulation of the ancient heroes continues in the literature, in films, in classroom textbooks, in official histories; its eradication is a concern of the Soviet regime today.[1]

KAZAKH LIFE IN 1950

The preceding description of the traditional Kazakh society and culture was included not only as background to the present, but primarily because whole sectors of Kazakhs continue more or less unchanged in that way of life, even though they are now members of a collective farm. Traditional Kazakh culture includes forces which have blocked accommodation to the Soviet pattern and forces which have permitted Sovietization. These forces will be taken up in turn.

In rural Kazakhstan, Kazakhs live in collective farms either as herders or as combined herders and farmers. They form the greater proportion of the population in the regions which are primarily devoted to herding, western and west-central Kazakhstan. Here they continue the old nomad life, pasturing their herds of sheep, goats, horses, cattle, and camels from winter camp to summer, reversing their path and completing the cycle in the fall. The winter camps are the focal points of community life, the stable centers of the annual round. Here after the summer dispersal the Kazakhs return to large adobe houses, structures which contain not only quarters for the extended family, but also stables, connecting corridors, and rooms for the storage of hay. Some of these house-stable-barn structures are a century old; it was about one hundred years ago that domiciles of this type were introduced into the area.[2]

The extended families and villages have been the basis of Kazakh adaptation to Sovietization. Kazakh herders continue to live in kin units, with the old aul or nomadic village as the core of the herding

[1] *Pravda*, 26 Dec 50, 19 Apr 51, and 28 Oct 52; *Voprosy Istorii*, 1951, No. 4, pp. 3-15.
[2] Kurbe and Makbova, 1952, pp. 43-45.

under the direction of the village leader. The leader and the elders decided all questions concerning village activities. The administration of justice was in the hands of the elders, while the enforcement of decisions was a common village enterprise; thus the village peace was kept. The raw framework of the village collectivity moved as a unit into the Soviet era.

The Kazakh lineage supplied the basis for the practice of marrying outside the group. The lineage occupied a common territory, and during the course of the past century the unit of common residence rather than the unit of descent and kinship has served to regulate marriage. Wives are sought outside the village; girls leave their native villages to join their husband's people, although this may not involve moving a great distance. The lineage is today generally identical with the village, and under the Soviet regime, with the collective farm. There is today the practice of kolkhoz exogamy.[1]

The practice of polygamy has likewise proved compatible with Soviet conditions. In former times, the many-wived family was the family of the well-born, the rich, the influential; today, the many-wived family is that of the village leader, the kolkhoz president, the brigade foreman. The leviratic marriage of the widow to the brother of the deceased or to another close kinsman has also accommodated itself to Soviet conditions, within the framework of the extended family, for among the peoples of the steppe this practice depends upon and reinforces the extended family structure. In Kazakhstan, the extended family rests on the close integration of several fraternal households and the conjugal families of a father and his sons and at times even grandsons.

The Soviet ideological campaign has directed attention to the practice of polygamy among leading elements in Kazakh collective farms; similarly, a number of reports indicate that leviratic marriage is still practiced. Soviet ethnographers do not discuss these institutions from the standpoint of the functions of the Kazakh extended family and the Kazakh village community. Instead, they have made a political issue out of what they are pleased to call the survival of the feudal mores. But they choose to ignore the fact that the practices which they condemn are part and parcel of the existing family and village system.

The status of women in Kazakhstan is a serious question to Soviet ideologists. In 1944, in 1949, and again in 1951, the Kazakh Party leadership was briefed by the Central Committee in Moscow regarding the participation of Kazakhs, of Kazakh women, and of literate and educated people in the Kazakh Communist Party (see Chapter 6, which deals with the Party). That the program has evidently fallen short of plan is suggested by the repetition of the instructions. The Kazakhs are not coming forward for training in Party work, despite the fact that they are periodically encouraged to do so, and despite the prestige and material advantages of Party membership. And the women lag behind the men in this respect.

Woman's position in Kazakh society, and the Soviet failure to understand the background of this position, has important consequences in the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[Great Horde]

621 by virtue of its fixed rules of admission (by birth or adoption); its perpetual life, or at any rate the survival of the life-cycle of its individual members; and its fixed locus of authority in the person of the village bii. The family community formed the core of the social grouping necessary for the nomads. Family members who stood in closest consanguinity were bound closely together through common, undivided ownership, which was a condition of life for small herds; isolated further kinsmen came to them and neighboring families connected through other relationships combined to form what Radlov[96] has called the smallest social unit, the aul, in its economic, juridical and other functions.

The Family in the Great Horde

•596 The Kazakh family was an extended family: three generations of males, grandfather, father, and son, were combined in a family; such at least was the ideal case, the desideratum, achieved when conditions were favorable: the rich Kazakh of the Great Horde kept his family together and formed a veritable extended family.[97] An allotment was made to the sons on marriage among those families who could afford it, while the poor paterfamilias

---

[96] Radloff, op. cit., I, 513.

[97] Izrastcov, 3.

[Great Horde]

596 could make no such allotment; the herd belonging to such a family was too small to allow for such a division.[98] Therefore it was held in common supporting those whom it could support, while those who were in excess might go off to join the family of a kinsman. The practices governing inheritance will be taken up below; here only certain aspects of family property can be treated. The son to whom allotment during the lifetime of the father was made on the occasion of the marriage of the son, lived and herded in common with his father.[99] Rights in the family property continued to be recognized even after brothers had separated, for example, if one brother died without male heirs, the family property passed to surviving brothers even if they did not live communally.[100]

593 671 602 685 The general position of the family in the social structure of the Great Horde may be drawn from its situation before the law. The criminal law of the Great Horde, as codified by Grodekov, had a number of references to the manner whereby theft within the family was handled. The Kazakh law in the matter of felony corresponded to what Durkheim has called restitutive law, rather than to his category of repressive law; and to the private delict in the somewhat more cumbersome terminology

---

[98] Ibid., 2; Radloff, op. cit., I, 513.

[99] Izrastsov, 3.

[100] Ibid., 70.

[Great Horde]

604 601 nological usages on the one side and inheritance practices and other kinship relations on the other. A most noteworthy feature of the dǎien relation is that it was a relationship in the maternal line, and this despite the preponderantly patrilineal orientation of the entire kinship structure. But it is not unusual to find matrilateral relations highlighted in a patrilineal society, and the paradox is only a seeming one, not real. The matrilateral relations will be found operative in rules of marriage.

•596 We have seen that there was some differentiation between the rich Kazakh family and the poor, especially in respect to family size. The rich family was more likely to be polygynous in composition, was more likely to attract to itself close collateral (agnatically related) kin, and kept its members together longer. The wealthy Kazakh family thus conforms more closely to a corporate entity than does the poor one; it survives the life span of its members. The poor family was more likely to be of the simple conjugal type, dissolving on the death of the father, the son forming a new conjugal family. Both the rich and the poor family conformed, 596 671 however, to another criterion of the corporate entity: they were a single personality in the eyes of such legal mechanisms as the Kazakhs possessed. That is, the aksakal or bii stepped in only with great reluctance when a family was riven by an internal dispute, if he stepped in at all.

596 671 We have seen how seizure of property (usually in livestock) was not regarded as theft between son and father, nephew and father's brother, or between sons of brothers; within certain limits, seizure between sister's son and mother's brother was not regarded as theft. Theft among family members was not recognized as such even where the members had set up separate households.[103]

596 The authority pattern was patriarchal within the family, whether of a wealthy or of a poor Kazakh. According to Dingelstedt, this was a categorical phenomenon: the authority of the father over the son, or the husband over the wife, was absolute.[104] This is corroborated for the Kazakhs of the Great Horde by Izrastsov, who asserts that the wife was without any rights, all rights residing in the husband, for example, in deciding on the marriage of the son or the daughter.[105] Both these statements are extreme, and must be qualified, as will be seen in what follows. Nevertheless, the patriarchal nature of the Kazakh household and family authority pattern must be accepted as a datum subject to slight amendment. We have seen that the father could even indenture his son for a fixed term, and apply the income to the family estate which he controlled.

---

[103] Dingelstedt, 148.

[104] Idem.

[105] Izrastsov, 67.

596 The family estate was not communal family property in the usual sense, nor can the paterfamilias be regarded as the owner of the family estate which he controlled. The family estate, both the physical and the intangible wealth, was an estate held in trust, and this definition fits the conception of the family (and the lineage) as a corporate structure.

Inheritance in the Great Horde

428 Properly speaking, only a small proportion of the family physical property was transmitted on the death of the father. Prior to his death, his sons, with the exception of the youngest son, had allotments made over to them of various kinds. In the normal course, these sons would have had a tent or yurt set up for them by the father,[106] which was generally done on marriage, but sometimes earlier, when they came of age; these two events, of course, might also be simultaneous. Thus, [584] youths among the Kazakhs were generally regarded as coming of age between their twelfth and fifteenth years; among those who could afford it, the marriage likewise [583] took place at or about this time.[107] The father likewise paid the kalym or bridewealth for these sons; and he gen-

[106] Radloff, Aus Sibirien, I, 477.

[107] Dingelstedt, 153; Izrastsov, 78.

428 erally supplied them with herds in sufficient quantity for independence, if he could afford it, and if he so wished.[108] On the other hand, a rich Kazakh might retain his sons by his side, or at least in the same household economy.

396 428 Kazakh families other than the rich were often forced by economic necessity to break up the family on allotment of the sons who had come of age. The father, once he had made provision for his sons, lost power over them, and they moved as they wished. But this quittance of obligation was a reciprocal relationship; the son lost all further claims on his father's wealth.[109] The poor Kazakhs made no allotment to their sons at all, since they could not afford to; it would have been uneconomical to break up the herd.

428 The youngest son was the residuary legatee of the father's property; he remained by his father's side until the latter's death, and acquired the father's tent, and such portions of the herds, etc., which the father had not made over previously to the elder sons.[110] In fact, the relationship between the youngest son and the parents was not restricted to the father; if the wife

---

[108] Dingelstedt, loc. cit.

[109] Izraztsov, 2-3.

[110] Dingelstedt, 153.

428 unknown to them.[115] The maximum which any of his children would receive was determined by the father; the minimum was often set by the elders and respected men of the community to whom appeal would be made by a dissatisfied heir.[116] The authority of these elders was advisory rather than coercive, however, for they had no means other than public opinion to cause the father to change his mind.[117]

428 ● 596 Further restrictions on the distribution of the family estate existed: a kalym or brideswealth had to be provided for all the sons, a mandatory provision in the Kazakh customary law.[118] *Again, if a man was squandering* his patrimony, a wife could appeal to his senior kinsmen, the elders of the community, and these men could adjudge the father irresponsible, and remove his estate from him. In such a case, the estate was usually allotted to a major son, or failing such, to the closest paternal kinsman to be held in trust for equal apportionment in the manner described above.[119] These evidently drastic measures could only have been found necessary rarely;

---

[115] Dingelstedt, loc. cit.

[116] Grodekov, 45.

[117] Dingelstedt, loc. cit.; Grodekov, loc. cit.

[118] Dingelstedt, loc. cit.

[119] Izrastsov, loc. cit.

[Great Horde]

428 nevertheless they must be regarded as limitations on
●596 the authority of the father, which was far from absolute therefore. It would be difficult to see, in any case, in view of what is known of Kazakh society and of the steppe societies generally, how a man could have an absolute authority, independent of all outside force, within his family. The family was far from an independent entity even as an extended family. It was part of a larger whole which included wider and wider reaches of collateral agnatically related lines, and hence extended both backward and forward in time.

429 The estate of a man went first to his sons, whether major or minor; if he died without male issue, the estate then adverted to his brothers. Even if the brothers had quarreled and were living apart, no one could prevent this order of succession, for the estate necessarily remained in the male line, if not the direct line, then in the closest collateral line.[120]

According to Izrastsov, the following was the order of succession:

1. Sons, grandsons, great-grandsons, etc.
2. Brothers, brothers' sons, their successors.
3. Father's brothers, father's brothers' sons, their successors.

In each group, the division was equal, subject to the

---

[120] Izrastsov, 5.

[Great Horde]

428 will of him who made the bequest. The inheritance passed to the second category if the first died without issue, then to the third if the second was not filled, and so forth.[121]

428 516 It is of importance to note that the inverse order of succession, namely, brothers before sons, was not the case. And it is difficult to see how this could possibly have been: the estate included not only real, but intangible property as well, and with its control was correlated a great amount of authority. Now if brothers quarreled, and they often did, then they would split up. If an estate descended fraternally before passing to the next succeeding generation, this would mean that the locus of authority was always on the verge of moving off. Such an unstable situation could be envisaged, but it would also necessitate certain corrective or compensatory measures in order to lessen the friction which might thus arise; still no such measures are found in Kazakh society. In general, among the Kazakhs, the Kara-Kirgis, the Kalmuks, the Buryats, and other steppe societies of Asia, the line of descent passed to the son, and failing a son it passed to the closest collateral line, whether that of the brother or that of the brother's son.

601 428 In addition to the evidence, both positive and negative, and the comparative material from other societies,

---

[121] Ibid., 11.

[Little Horde]

62) the greater degree of concentration in the winter. Radlov has given the etymology of aul from agyl, enclosure, cognate with the Mongol ayil. The Mongol ayil was indeed a circle, according to the descriptions of Shchapov for the Buryats, Pozdneev for the Khalkha Mongols, and Vladimirtsov for the Mongols of earlier times. That of the Little Horde Kazakhs and of the Turkmen, their neighbors to the south, had apparently opened out; the same is true of the Kalmuk nomadic village.

[103]

The Family in the Little Horde

396 The data bring out a number of features shared by the Little Horde families with other Kazakh and Turco-Mongol groups. The family was agnatic, it was patrilocal in residence, and it was of the extended family type, that is, the family into which one was born was the same as that which one procreated on marriage. The extended family had a personality before the law, it extended beyond the life span of any individual member, and in general conforms with the conception of the corporate structure which has already been advanced here, apud Maine, Weber, and Fortes. The family was the unit of economic production and consumption, and it was the unit of production of children. It could become the unit of nomadic movement if it was identical with a village. Otherwise, as we have seen, the village is the unit of nomadic movement.

[Little Horde]

583 If a man really abducted a daughter from her family, his family was required either to furnish a daughter in exchange from its own midst or from among the closely related families, or to pay a full kalym for her. If the girl herself was returned after the abduction, an indemnity was imposed on the family of the abductor, since the girl could no longer command a full kalym.[202] Abduction for cause, however, such as delay in surrendering the bride after the kalym had been paid in full, could not be punished.[203] The requirement of the full kalym for an abduction was in itself a kind of imposition of an indemnity, for it placed a great economic burden on a family which ordinarily demanded years to get rid of, an indemnity which in the case of an unlawful abduction had to be paid in a short term.

596 602 From the data on the payment of the kalym,[1] it may be seen that the family was patriarchal in authority, patrilineal in descent, and patrilocal in residence. There is a certain amount of evidence that the family of the groom paid a psychic capital in the form of prestige and respect to the family of the bride, in addition to the material goods which exchanged hands. The taboo on face-to-face contact between the youth and his pro-

---

[202] Balliusek, 82.

[203] Ibid., 79-80.

1 [Cf. especially, Cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 477ff. -- Analyst]

[Little Horde]

596 spective wife's elder male kin is but one aspect of
602 this respect relationship, another being that of the function of the go-between, and the initiation of the betrothal proceedings by the family of the groom, who came as supplicants for the daughter-in-law. Nevertheless, a family did not wish to have daughters, it desired sons, even though it might gain some prestige
[581] by marrying the daughters off. The emphasis on sons[1] is a correlate of the patrilineal orientation of the entire society, its patri-centrism in values.

595 The Kazakh family of the Little Horde, as elsewhere on the steppe, was polygynous if it could afford to be. On the Mangyshlak peninsula at the beginning of the 20th century it was estimated that 50 percent of the marriages were monogamous and the other 50 percent consisted of two wives, although the Kazakhs were permitted as many as five in theory. The motivation for seeking a second wife was accounted to be childlessness[204] and is exemplified in the proverb, "The more mares the more colts."[205] The Kazakhs were fully aware that the solution of one problem, the need for children, precisely, male issue, in turn raised another issue, that of possible conflict between the wives. The wives therefore were kept in separate tents;[206] again, a man rarely married a second wife without the prior consent of the first.[2]

[1] [cf. especially, cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 478 -- Analyst]

[2] [for foot note cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 482 -- Analyst]

[204] Karutz, Kirgische Hochzeit, 42.

[205] Altynsarin, 103.

[206] Karutz, loc. cit.

[Little Horde]

equal to that of the sons in the inže, her share taking the form of a dowry or marriage portion.[219] Unfortunately, it is nowhere corroborated that the inže was of recent date (as of the year 1872), and the equal participation of the daughter was definitely limited to wealthy Kazakhs, who made a dotal settlement equal to the kalym they received for the daughter as a matter of prestige.

It is the ideal family situation which is here described: the wealthy family could afford to realize in practice the family ideal by maintaining the extended family unity. When the son was portioned off, he remained within the family enclave or aul, which was in turn identical with the extended family of the wealthy. For in such a case, the collateral lines, including father's younger brothers, and their sons, and their sons' sons, lived together with the father, his sons, and their families and offspring in one great community. When Pater Schmidt equates the Grossfamilie with the aul of the Kirgis-Kazakh, his equation can be accepted in the light of the considerations here entertained: that it relates to the ideal family, the sought-after family, the wealthy family.[220]

In the transmission of the property from one gen-

---

[219] Idem.

[220] Schmidt, Eigentum, 187.

[Cf. Cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, pp. 486-488--Analyst]

These descent lines formed the aristocracy, while the commoners were the estate of the kara sŭök. The distinction maintained by the end of the 19th century was no longer that of purity of descent in a particular line, but rather by wealth, between rich and poor Kazakhs.[243]

Aul and Family; Aul-Family in the Inner Horde

The lineage was composed of a number of auls whose members were agnatically related to each other more closely than to other members of the lineage. Where possible, a single extended family might form an entire aul of five to ten tents. Such an aul would be composed of a father, his married sons, their children, sometimes close collateral kin of the father, and if possible, four generations of patrilineal descent. This, however, was more often the case in the past than it was at the end of the 19th century, when sons had a greater tendency to break away on marriage--i.e., on being apportioned by the father. Authority in the aul passed to the eldest son on the death of the father. Authority was patriarchal except when, on the death of the father while the sons were still minor, the senior widow held the authority in trust, together with the entire estate, until the sons came of age.[244]

---

[243] Ibid., 47, 52.

[244] Ibid., 110.

[Inner Horde]

621 This pattern obtained for the lineage, for the aul, for
596 the extended family, and in those cases, a fortiori,
when any or all coalesced in one unit. The aul was the
nomadic unit, which camped, moved, and pastured its
herds together.

595 The family was polygynous, but the usual family had but one wife, and more than two wives in a family was virtually unknown. Two reasons are given, the kalym was high and women were few. In the polygynous household, the first wife was in a favored position, for she could only be punished by the husband, while she in turn could punish the others, a distaff reflection of the rule of patriarchal authority and of seniority. This contrasts with the situation in the Great Horde, where
[562] the first wife had no such preferred status. On the other hand, the wife enjoyed considerable freedom in general, and there was something close to equality of the spouses.[245]

428 The children of all the wives inherited equally from the father, and both sons and daughters shared in the estate,[246] the daughters' portions being the settlement of a dowry. On the marriage of the first-born son, he was usually charged with the support of the senior wife, his mother, in keeping with the prin-

---

[245] Ibid., 107-108.

[246] Ibid., 108.

[Inner Horde]

428 ciple of primogeniture. The custom of ultimogeniture, whereby the youngest son was the residuary legatee and likewise received the title of "prince of the hearth," also was practiced. Despite this favored treatment of the youngest son, the actual authority passed to the eldest son, ceteris paribus, i.e., if he were of good health in mind and body, etc.[247]

586 Divorce is reported as having been easy and fre-
596 quent among the Kazakhs of the Inner Horde,[248] but
177.59 since this is totally unlike other reports on the Kazakhs, it is to be understood as a reflection of acculturative conditions, and not a normal situation. Nevertheless, patriarchal authority, and the extended family as a continuing unit, tended to resist acculturation: the daughter-in-law would be chosen not by the son in question, nor yet by his father necessarily, but by the patriarchal head of the entire extended family.[249] On the other hand, under the conditions of culture contact, a tendency toward neo-local marriage residence arose in the closing decades of the 19th century.[250]

[591]

601 Kinship Terminology: General Considerations

The Kazakh kinship terminology differs in many

---

247 Ibid., 108-111.

248 Ibid., 108.

249 Ibid., 110.

250 Idem.

621 wee that it preserved a number of features of a time We
1776 when acculturation was less advanced, giving ground in others: the growth of farming and the administrative reshuffling by the Russians were the main acculturative influences, but there were other minor ones, in technology for instance, which were not without an effect on the kinship picture. The increase in the gathering and storage of hay[283] influenced the nomadic cycle of the still-pastoral Kazakhs, encouraging some to continue to be herders, lessening the scope of movement of others, factors closely bound up with kinship. On the other hand, the scythes, etc., necessary for mowing, had to be purchased from the Russians, making for an increase in commodity exchange, closer economic interaction with the Russians, and an acceleration of the acculturative process once again.

Family and Marriage

596 The Kazakh family in the 1920's was an extended family and as such continued to form the innermost of a series of concentric circles of kinship; like the next outer concentric circle, the nomadic village, and like the outermost, the lineage, it was founded on an agnatically related membership, it was patrilocal, patriarchal,

---

[283] Ibid., 24.

[1 [i.e., the nomadic village kin community of the northeastern Kazakhs (Altai Kazakhs) --Analyst]

596 and valuistically oriented toward the need for sons, patricentric-filiocentric. The Kazakh family in the early Soviet era was conservative, even archaic in these respects; in others, a number of acculturative innovations had intervened. The eradication of the distinction between black bone and white bone had been complete by then; the social stratification was now simplified to rich and poor; even influence reckoned in terms of the number of kinsmen came to play a subordinate role.[284] A wealthy Kazakh would find those eager to establish a close agnatic relationship with him, support him in disputes, and thus seek his favor.

177.55
556

595 The factor of wealth determined not only the number
556 of those who asserted close consanguinity, it also correlated directly with affinity. Polygyny was permitted and continued to be practiced into the 1920's,[285] although the Soviet regime sought half-heartedly to make monogamy universal (checked at that time by a laissez-faire policy toward nationalities). The wealthy Kazakh could afford plural wives, although he rarely had more than two; there is one case of an exceptionally important man who had three wives, but his circumstances indicate his outstanding position; for example, his aul had 13 tents in it, whereas the aul in these parts ranged between

---

[284] Ibid., 66.

[285] Ibid., 67.